

Appl. No. 10/726, 778
Amendment dated January 17, 2005
Reply to office action of 11-17-2004

R E M A R K S

By the above- identified office action, a restriction to one of the following inventions under 35 USC 121 was required, and it was advised that the reply to this requirement to be complete must include an election of the invention to be examined even though the requirement be traversed. The inventions identified were I.) Claims 1, 4, 6 and 7; II.) Claims 9, 11, 12, 14 and 15; and III.) Claim 16.

By the instant amendment, the invention of group II, Claims 9, 11, 12, 14 and 15, is elected for examination at this time. It is believed that the inventions of the three groups are not independent and distinct but rather merely differ in scope. This is believed to be evidenced by the fact that all three groups belong in the same class, namely class 210. It is noted that the invention of group I has already been indicated to contain allowable subject matter and may be made subject to a divisional application should the election requirement be made final.


Appl. No. 10/726, 778
Amendment dated January 17, 2005
Reply to office action of 11-17-2004

Reconsideration, re-examination, and early allowance are accordingly respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

Rudy A. Vandenbelt *et al.*

By:



Albert Peter Durigon
Reg. No. 30,049

Law Office of A. P. Durigon
20 Eustis Street
Cambridge, Massachusetts 02140-2387
617-354-7330 (Telephone)
617-497-0229 (Telecopier)
apdurigon@comcast.net (email)

Page 3 of 3